

LIVERPOOL CLASSICAL MONTHLY (LCM) Volume 8 Number 1 January 1983

Edited and published from Liverpool by John Pinsent, MA DPhil.,
Dept of Greek, The University, PO Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX,
who is the sole proprietor and to whom, addressed by name, sub-
scriptions, and contributions on any subject of classical inter-
est, should be sent, and to whom, also by name only, cheques and
checks made payable.

RATES p.a. of 10 issues (not August and September)

SURFACE £4 UK & Europe, \$(US)10 elsewhere:

AIR £5.50 Europe, \$(US)20 N.America, \$(US)25 Australasia.



CONTENTS, the copyright in which remains in each case with
the author and is so secured at the end of each
article.

J.PINSENT(Liverpool): *Sophocles*, Antigone 332-375

1- 4

C.J.ROWE(Bristol): de Aristotelis in tribus libris Ethicorum dicendi ratione:
particles, connectives and style in three books from the
Aristotelian ethical treatises. PART I

4-11

Review: T.P.WISEMAN(Exeter)

12

Brian Arkins, *Sexuality in Catullus* (Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien, Band VIII),
Georg Olms, Hildesheim 1982. pp. x + 260. ISBN 3 487 07277 7.

A.A.R.HENDERSON(Glasgow): *acuta cupressus* (Ovid, Met.3.155)

13

J.A.CROOK(St John's College, Cambridge): *P.Turner* 34

13-14

YVAN NADEAU(Arts Faculty Office, Edinburgh): *Juvenal translated* (Juvenal 2.149-159)

14-16

J.PINSENT(Liverpool): *Pindar*, Nemean 1.24 & Olympian 13.3

16

It will be seen that, thanks to the kindness of the Library of the Queen's University, Belfast, and in particular of its Senior Sub-Librarian, W.Gordon Wheeler, MA, FLA, LCM has acquired a device, and should perhaps now call itself *Lions' Classical Monthly*, or is it that the Editor is continuously fighting against time to ensure their monthly ration of information to the young lions who read LCM. It is one of those of Nikolaus Brylinger, who was printing at Basel, some 60 odd books between 1538 and 1564, in fact that used for his Xenophon of 1555, which the Editor prefers to the earlier version from the Homer of 1551 (with Bartholomaeus Staehelin: in both cases the form of the name is that preferred in the British Library *STC* of German books, 1455-1600 [1962]), also illustrated here, in which the third figure is perhaps the lioness (who in nature, it seems, does all the work). Brylinger also used at least one other device, Arion on the dolphin, playing a viol or violin with a bow, and the Editor, among whose (too many?) interests is also Bibliography, would be glad of further information about Brylinger, and, ideally, a full set of xeroxed title-pages, and grateful to any contributors and readers who can help.

The Editor traditionally inaugurates each volume with a contribution of his own, and is happy also to include, if not an article, at least a review by T.P.Wiseman, the first contributor. That he has also practised Ring Composition indicates only that he was able to rely on himself to fill the final gap exactly, and also to demonstrate how quickly LCM can publish responses - and other contributors who wish to respond as quickly are only a post away -, not that he subscribes to that theory of editorship which he heard from the late H.M.Last, who once referred to a journal in which all the articles were by the Editor 'a perfectly legitimate method of publication'.

Last month the Editor denied chalcentery in himself and his readers. Events seem to have belied him - but the contribution on Aristotle's *Ethics* seemed to him of sufficient importance to merit publication even if it has to be serial. He was also in error, he is informed by those who knew him better than did the Editor, that Professor Austin never applied the words 'silly' and 'capering' to the Greeks or to their language, and that the attribution certainly made in these parts at the material time was false and even slanderous. He is happy to correct the record, while providing another example of the unreliability of oral tradition. He is also reminded by those who know better than he did that Winchcomb, where he was born, is not in Devon, but in Gloucestershire (but he is no more a Tailor than a Ram): his grandfather, however, did rent a farm at Rocombe, near Teignmouth, in Devon, until the cider harvest failed some time in the 80s or 90s and he could not make a rent, and moved to Hampshire, so that the Editor may justly claim to be *origine Dummoniensis* if not *natu*.



This is rather a formal analysis of the structure of the ode than, as it was intended to be when I wrote it some time ago, a structuralist analysis. It is more than the pietas due an old tutor that leads me to note particularly here the recent and sensitive treatment by R.W.B. Burton, *The chorus in Sophocles' tragedies*, Oxford, Clarendon 1980, 96-104, which persuades me that I was on the right lines, and which also 'relates the song to the intellectual climate in which Sophocles and his audience lived' (98-101). I owe much to the comments and criticisms of the friends and colleagues to whom I showed a first draft.

Since P. Friedländer, *Hermes* 69 (1934), 56-63, established the connexion of this ode with that of Aeschylus, *Choephoroi* 585-651, it has been clear that τὰ δεινὰ are more than the 'wonders' of many English translators and critics (cf. *The Oxford book of Greek verse*, 1930, p. 325 no. 321, quoting Hamlet, 'What a piece of work is a man!'). Burton, 96, translates 'formidable' in both places; later he goes further and suggests that man is 'a sort of portent, a τέρας or monstrum' (97). If in Aeschylus we punctuate πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ τρέφει | δεινὰ, δεινῶν ἄνθρωποι, taking δεινὰ there too as a noun (in this I think I have the support of my colleague, Dr. H. J. Blumenthal), we may perhaps go further still and translate as almost 'monsters'. For Aeschylus goes on to find more terrible (by way of the question τίς λέγει; 595) than the monsters he has enumerated in the first strophe, both ὑπέρτολμον ἀνδρὸς κρῶνιμα (594-5) and γυναικῶν φρεσὶν ἐλπίδων | παντόλμους ἔρωτας (both τόλμα and φρόνιμα in Sophocles, 371 and 354), and for the latter he has provided the mythological paradigms of Meleager's mother, Althaea, Nisus' daughter, and the Lemnian women, with whom by implication he associates Clytemnestra, all of whom have killed relatives or husbands (G. Thomson, in his commentary on the *Oresteia*, Ag. 1231-3 and *Cho.* 583, gives parallels showing that woman as δεινόν or θρόνον became a misogynistic commonplace). At the end of Sophocles' ode the Chorus deny association to the person ὅτ' τὸ μὴ καλὸν | εὔνεσσι τόλμας χάριν, that is, in the context, the person who has dared to bury Polynices, who is immediately revealed as Antigone and described, unless it is the revelation, as a δαιμόνιον τέρας. As in Aeschylus, the worst δεινόν is a woman.

I now consider the formal structure of the ode, first setting it out in general and then adding some notes on points of detail.

1. στρ.α Man's activities in WILD NATURE
 - a. the SEA (333-7)
 - b. the EARTH (337-341)
 - i. BIRDS (342-3) air
 - ii. ANIMALS (344) land
 - iii. FISHES (345-6) sea
 - b. TAME
 - i. HORSE (351-2)
 - ii. BULL (352-3)
2. αντ.α in the ANIMAL WORLD
 - a. WILD
 - i. SPEECH (353)
 - ii. THOUGHT (353-4)
 - iii. ἀστυνόμους ὄρνιθας (355-6)
 - b. PHYSICAL
 - i. WEATHER (356-9)
 - ii. (negative) DEATH (361-2)
 - iii. DISEASE (363-4)
3. στρ.β in CULTURE
 - a. INTELLECTUAL
 - i. SPEECH (353)
 - ii. THOUGHT (353-4)
 - iii. ἀστυνόμους ὄρνιθας (355-6)
 - b. PHYSICAL
 - i. WEATHER (356-9)
 - ii. (negative) DEATH (361-2)
 - iii. DISEASE (363-4)
4. αντ.β The moral ambiguity of τέχνη
 - introducing a. THE JUST CITIZEN (368-70) (368-70)
 - b. THE UNJUST CITIZEN (370-5) (370-5)

This formal structure is not exactly symmetrical (2b, the TAMING of ANIMALS, seems to be introduced by a reference to hunting, 348-350, which might possibly be seen as a reference to the DOG), but Structuralists will note that 1 & 2 refer to NATURE and 3 & 4 to CULTURE. But the opposition is already implicit in Jebb, on 343-53, who sees an ascending scale of achievement: but his four levels 1) conquest of nature, 2) capture of animals, 3) taming of animals, 4) 'development of social and intellectual life' do not distinguish αντ.β, the just and the unjust citizen.

NOTES. 1. The moral ambiguity of man's activities is. I think, already in ἀποτρέπεται 339, by no means a melioristic word, certainly not in later Greek, and hardly the treatment due the highest of the gods (though the adjective is not elsewhere used of gods): there is no trace of the idea either that, in the Golden Age, Earth willingly yielded up her fruits, or that there is anything virtuous or character-building in agricultural work.

2. The division of animals 342-6 is by the three elements Air, Earth and Water. If W.G. Headlam is right, as reported by Thomson on *Cho.* 583, Aeschylus had a more complicated classification in his στρ.α, viz.:

ANIMATE in EARTH and SEA (585-8), INANIMATE in AIR (fire) (588-90),
ANIMATE in EARTH and SEA (591), INANIMATE in AIR (wind) (5912).

3. In his relation to wild nature man is called περιωραδής 347: the adverb is used formulaically in the *Iliad* (1.466, 2.429, 7.318, 24.624: *Odyssey* 14.431, 19.423), of cooking (! - so that man belongs firmly in the cultural sphere of *le cuit*!). It is then by thoughtful skill that man is enabled to catch (and cook!) wild animals, and this foreshadows στρ.α, in which παντοπόρος 360 makes the same point of technical skill, so

that *ἀπιρος* ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἔρχεται | τὸ μέλλον 360-361. The word is only attested otherwise in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* in the phrase 'εἰρωτῆς μ' Ἐκάεργε περιφραδῆς' (4.464). There it is almost certainly accusative, as Allen and Sikes translate, and not the vocative suggested by their punctuation. For the Odyssean *εἰρωτῆς* is normally followed by an object. *Hermes* goes on to refer to τέχνης ἡμετέρας 465, the lyre, and so the word is firmly in a context of 'craft' whether or not there is also a reference to Apollo's oracular craft which also dealt with τὸ μέλλον.

In Sophocles' *στρ.β* παντοπόρος refers to the intellectual and physical basis of civilized life (353-359), while in *ἀντ.α* περιφραδῆς referred to his capture of animate nature (342-347). παντοπόρος is at once opposed by ἀπιρος, but that sentence is only the same positive assertion cast in a negative form. It does however at once suggest the one thing against which man is ἀπιρος, Death, which comes to all men and against which he finds no φερέειν 362, as he was able δύσσομρα φεύγειν βέλη 359. But two of the words employed in the second half of *ἀντ.α* are echoed in the final optimistic sentence of *στρ.β* in which diseases are contrasted with death, φυγὰς 363 immediately taking up φερέειν 362. Thus περιφραδῆς 347 is echoed by συμπεράσσειν 364 and μηχαναῖς 349 by ἀμαχανῶν 363.

4. In the final stanza the ode comes close to the subject of the play, and the attitudes of the Chorus both to Creon and to the offender are defined by implication. Civilized life is presented by the contrast between the JUST and UNJUST citizen (368-375), but by implication also that between the just and unjust ruler. The just keeps the laws both of the land and of the gods (νόμους ... χθονὸς | θεῶν τ' ἔνορκον δίκαν 368-9: the juxtaposition χθονὸς/θεῶν suggest to me that these are two contrasted elements and should not be taken together as equivalent to e.g. 'the laws which enshrine the justice of the gods'). The ambiguity of both main characters in the play is that neither has done so. Creon makes and upholds the laws of the land, but does so neglecting, and in opposition to, the laws of the gods: Antigone breaks the former in order to uphold the latter.

The reference to the person *ὅππ' τὸ μὴ καλὸν | εὖνεστι τόλμας χάριν* in the first place points to the person who has buried Polynices, but who is going to turn out to be an example of that traditional monster, woman, subject of the ode in the *Choephoroi* (with τόλμας 371 cf. παντόλμως *Cho.* 597). But it can apply also to the Sophoclean tyrant, as defined in the *Oedipus tyrannus* 863-896, in which, I may say *obiter* that I find a reference to Oedipus, who has been given in his scenes with Creon and Tiresias all the characteristics of the traditional tyrant, in order, I think, that his fate may not seem to the audience as morally repugnant as, Aristotle said at *Poetics* 1452b33-36, must be that of the absolutely good man. Thus, in the second place, the reference at 370-371 points also to Creon, who has dared to break the laws of the gods.

To this person, that is to Creon as much as to Antigone, the Chorus propose exclusion from the successive spheres of association from which also Nestor in *Iliad* 9.63, proposes to exclude *ὃς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ἀκουσέντος* (which would be a fair description of Polynices), who is to be ἀκηρῆται ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιος, 'outlawed from the clan, the law, and the hearth' as Willcock translates it in his commentary on *Iliad* 1-12 (1978). The hearth is common to both passages (παρέστιος 372) and so is the city (πόλις 370), the legislative social unit implied in ἀθέμιστος. Both in the *Iliad* and in the *Antigone* it is the kings who lay down θέμις, such as the ordinance not to bury Polynices. It is tempting, therefore, to try and refer *ἴσον φρονῶν* 374 to the third sphere of association in *Iliad* 9, the φρατρία, on the specious formal grounds that the Chorus are not competent to legislate for the city, but may do so for the family and the clan. But it is better to take the references in 373-4 to be the same as those in 368-9, παρέστιος to the family as the sphere of the gods and ἴσον φρονῶν as related to ἰσονομία and referring to the νόμους θεῶν.

5. The last words of the Chorus, *ὃς τὰδ' ἔρδοι*, ostensibly refer to the general description *ὅππ' τὸ μὴ καλὸν | εὖνεστι τόλμας χάριν*, which is, as was suggested immediately, ambiguous as between Creon and the person who buried the body. But it is at once given more direct reference to that person, now identified as Antigone, by the anapaests 376-8, in which occur the words δαιμόνιον τέρας 376 that once again connect the ode with that in the *Choephoroi*. It has indeed turned out that the monstrous person *ὃς τὰδ' ἔρδοι* is after all doubly a monster, for it is a woman, socially monstrous like those of the paradigms of the *Choephoroi* because she is disloyal to those to whom she should be loyal, here to Creon; not only king of the city but also her uncle and legal head of her οἶκος.

The type of classification employed in this ode, and the mode of thinking which it implies, seems to have been natural to Sophocles and to the Greek thinkers whose views of the evolution of civilization may lie behind it (Protagoras if Burton is right, pp.100-101). It is to be found in such polar Greek concepts as φύσις/νόμος and in the technique of Platonic and Aristotelian definition, and is perhaps implicit in the concept of negation. Here it is the concepts of τέχνη and μηχανή which key the ode into the dramatic situation. It is not only the enormity of the burial which has impressed the Chorus but also the technical skill which was exhibited in its first, undetected performance. Its perpetrator has been παντοπόρος as well as πανούργος, and like Sisyphus or Autolycus, paradigmatic clever knaves, has demonstrated the bad side of τέχνη and of τὸ μηχανεῖν, the latter of which, as the Chorus say, *τοτὲ μὲν κακόν, ἀλλοτ' ἐπ' ἐσθλόν ἔρπει*, and to both of which they have been,

4 throughout the ode, at least somewhat ambiguous.

This ambiguity may throw some light on the question of the respective guilt of Creon and Antigone in the eyes of the Chorus and indeed of Sophocles himself, if it is legitimate to suppose that he had, or disclosed a view. For the binary classification found at 368- νόμους ... χάρις | θεῶν τ' ἔννομον δίκαν suggests that this ambiguity is ineradicable, and the conflict between the two realms of family and state irresolvable - a somewhat Hegelian conclusion! Despite the very tentative suggestion of the Chorus at 278-9, μή τι καὶ θεήλατον | τοῦτον τόδ', which serves to trigger off in Creon the typically tyrannical behaviour of 280-314, it seems from this ode that they have not yet finally made up their minds that the action is just and not monstrous. It was noted above that the man who is excluded from the three spheres of association in *Iliad* 9 is the man who loves civil war, and that it is a very fair description of Polynices. It can therefore be argued that by his action he too put himself in the position of the person ὅπως τὸ μὴ καλὸν | εὖν-εστι τόλμος χάριν to whom a similar exclusion is applied. Polynices is therefore ἀνέστος, and it can be further argued that among the *droits de famille* from which he is excluded is the right of family burial, so that, in acting as she does, Antigone is failing to appreciate the full implications of Polynices' action, and the basis of Creon's case.

Copyright (C) 1983 J.Pinsent

C.J. ROWE (Bristol): de Aristotelis in tribus libris Ethicorum dicendi ratione: *particles, connectives and style in three books from the Aristotelian ethical treatises. PART I.* LCM 8.1 (Jan. 1983), 4-11

I am grateful to Dr Kenny himself for reading and commenting on an earlier draft of this paper. The present version owes much to his comments, I have also taken notice of valuable points made about the same draft by M.D. Reeve. The research on which the paper is based was finally, and belatedly, completed during a term of study-leave, for which I thank the University of Bristol and my colleagues. May such generosity be allowed to continue.

This paper represents an attempt to discover the extent to which the of particles and connective (Oxford 1978), is likely, in the end, to help us to decide the so-called problem of the 'common books' (i.e. whether '*Nicomachean Ethics*' 5-7 - hereafter, in accordance with Kenny's practice, labelled AE A-C - should in fact be read with the undisputed *Nicomachean* books, labelled NE 1-4, 8-10, or rather, as Kenny argued, with EE 1-3, 7-8, a torso which by habit we treat as the whole of the *Eudemian Ethics*). Kenny's results in this part of his book were at least *prima facie* convincing: in a remarkably high proportion of cases simple counts of particles and connectives, supported by a battery of statistical arguments, associated AE usage with EE rather than with NE¹. But his methods here have met with less than complete acceptance. In the present paper, I shall begin by trying to drive home some objections to these methods; then, towards the end, I shall change to a more positive tack, and show that, properly interpreted, Aristotle's behaviour in this important area of word-usage can still provide evidence in support of the proposed solution to the problem of AE².

A first and crucial objection to Kenny's methods is that they are too crude. What he counts in each case is occurrences of a group of letters corresponding to a single entry in the lexicon: ἀλλά, ἄν, γὰρ, γέ, etc.; that is, his counts fail to discriminate between distinct uses of lexical items, as e.g. between ὅτι = 'that' and ὅτι = 'because', or between disjunctive and comparative ἢ. Let us take a single lexical item x such that it has three distinct uses, x^1 , x^2 and x^3 (as a working principle I propose to treat two uses of an item as 'distinct' if they fulfil one or more of the following conditions: 1) they differ in meaning or function³; 2) they form an enabling part of different syntactical structures⁴;

1. Kenny finally settles on a list of 24 items, which are the ones occurring often enough in NE or EE to allow the application of the statistical tests (Kenny pp.90-91).
2. It may be, in fact, that Kenny has enough evidence for his conclusion about AE even without his needing to look at particles and connectives at all: see perhaps especially the figures in Table 5.4 on p.118 of his book. But if in the end there is evidence here too in his favour, so much the better; and it will be as well in any case to get the argument right. Beyond that, the present study may be regarded as a contribution to the study of style in general and of Aristotle's style in particular.
3. I add 'or function' because it will be difficult to assign a separate 'meaning' to all items in the list by themselves (ἄν is one obvious example); some items, again, will combine with others in special uses, where the 'meaning' may belong only to the combination as a whole (cf. e.g. ὁ ὅσον, μὲν ὅσον).
4. E.g. ἄν in indefinite clauses and in apodotes of conditional sentences: ἐλ in conditions

3) the ranges of items which might substitute for each use are different⁵; 4) the ranges of syntactical structures which might substitute for those structures of which each forms an enabling part are different).

Now, if the gross figures for x in NE, AE and EE are significantly irregular⁶, this may in principle be because the figures for either one or more than one of x^1 , x^2 and x^3 are irregular; again, NE may significantly favour x^1 by comparison with AE and EE, while AE and EE favour x^2 and x^3 , and so on. None of these cases need concern Kenny overmuch; either his conclusion is to some degree imprecise, or he has not identified further arguments in support of his case. There are, however, two possible cases which should worry him more: firstly, there might be a significant leaning on the part of AE and EE towards x^1 , but also a significant leaning on the part of NE and AE towards, say, x^2 ; we need only suppose that examples of x^1 are much more numerous than those of x^2 , so that the bias of NE and AE towards x^2 is swamped by the bias of AE and EE towards x^1 . The second worrying possibility is that an irregular gross count for x might overlie regular counts for x^1 , x^2 and x^3 . Of course, for this to happen the separate groups of figures for x^1 , x^2 and x^3 would have to be either too small for the application of the relevant statistical tests (in which case, though this will not affect the point at issue, they will presumably not be strictly describable as 'regular'), or relatively close to showing the same pattern of irregularity as the gross figures for x . But if x^1 , x^2 and x^3 are distinct from each other in the sense defined, is it then really plausible to base any argument on the figures for the three uses added together? Why should we add x^1 to x^2 and x^3 rather than to y^2 and z^3 , which show a different pattern of frequency? (in the following chapter, Kenny introduces a method which explicitly entails the grouping together of different items, in order to deal with the special problem of small samples; but this method does not appear to be relevant to the present case⁷). If we turn to the situation where the gross figures for x are regular, those for x^1 , x^2 and x^3 may also be regular; or else they might severally show patterns which were either all irregular, but with the irregularities cancelling each other out, or partly regular and partly irregular⁸. Here too, it is easy to see how Kenny's argument might be disturbed.

If all this is right, it means that we cannot strictly judge the strength or weakness of any argument which Kenny bases on counts for any item which possesses two or more distinct uses, unless and until we know the separate counts for those uses. He is committed to arguing that contexts written in association with each other will by and large resemble each other in word-usage, i.e. in the relative frequency and distribution of tokens of each word-type. But the majority of the particles and connectives which he considers are not properly treated as single word-types; rather they are, from the point of view of stylistics, conglomerations of word-types which may be no more connected with each other than accidental homonyms⁹. The only possible hypothesis which could justify treating $\delta\tau\iota$ or η (to take the same two examples as before) as single word-types would be that Aristotle might have been more in love with those particular sounds at some times than at others; but that is, to say the least, unlikely. One might perhaps reasonably expect that irregularity and regularity in the gross counts for any such items would usually arise from similar

and in indirect questions. It may be that differences like this are already sufficiently covered under the first condition; if so, I shall not mind.

5. This and the following condition I add merely as possibly helpful rules of thumb for identifying what I have called differences of meaning or function. They are not usable by themselves, since not all items or structures will obviously have substitutes available for them. In general, this is a dark area in which to operate. I shall later give a minimal list of those uses among Kenney's items which I regard as 'distinct' according to the guidelines adopted; we may wish either to add to or to subtract from the list, but the fundamental point, that some uses of some items are distinct from others, is surely not a matter for dispute. $\delta\tau\iota$ and η provide two such indisputable cases.

6. I.e. if there are significant differences between the figures for x in any two of NE, AE and EE, where significance will be measured by any or all of the statistical tests which Ke Kenny applies.

7. Pp.128ff.. The method adopted there specifically involves a grouping of indicator words: each group 'must consist in general of words which are either Nicomachean favourites or Eudemian favourites' ('in general', because the method apparently allows the addition to the group of items which do not show the same bias, merely to bring the total occurrences of members of the group to the required level). In our hypothetical case, the group represented by x may from the point of view of stylometry be as random as one consisting of x^1 , y^2 and z^3 ; $x^1 + x^2 + x^3$ (even $x^1 + y^2 + z^3$) might happen to meet Kenny's specification, but this cannot be predicted in advance.

8. I.e. if, again, the totals for the regular use(s) sufficiently outnumbered the other one(s).

9. See n.7 above.

6 patterns of irregularity and regularity among their different uses; but even the theoretical possibility of false signals should give us pause.

In order to check how far these points affect Kenny's actual results for NE, AE and EE, I have analysed the uses of the twenty-four particles and connectives on which his case finally rests in three sample books, namely NE IV, AE A (= 'NE' V) and EE III. I have restricted the analysis to three books because I have necessarily counted by hand (no computer programme yet devised is, I take it, sufficiently sensitive to make the necessary distinctions), because hand-counting is extremely laborious, and because three books are the minimum necessary (i.e. one to serve as sample from each of the three relevant groups of books)¹⁰.

The reasons for the choice of these particular three books are a) that NE IV and EE III are more similar in subject-matter to each other than either is to AE A, so that any influence which subject-matter may have on the usage of particles/connectives (an issue which I shall raise separately at a later stage) will be roughly evened out between the NE and EE samples, and coincidences between either and the AE sample will be that much more significant; and b) that if AE belonged to NE (whatever sense we choose to attach to 'belonging'), A would occur next to NE IV, and if AE belongs to EE, next to EE III, and it is at least the most economical hypothesis to suppose that juxtaposed books would be the most closely associated in style (if only because juxtaposed books are more likely - one would suppose - to share the same style; not that the lapse of time will necessarily affect style, nor that, if it does, it will be the only such factor: other possible factors are e.g. differences of purpose and audience). But my chief interest in the three books is just as samples of NE, AE and AA as wholes.

On Kenny's tests NE shows up as almost chronically irregular in usage, and EE as fairly irregular, which might suggest that no sample of at least these two groups of books could be treated as properly representative. My analysis of the three books will, however, by itself suggest strong reasons for playing down this point, and I shall assume in my argument that NE, AE and EE are unities; although we cannot finally discount the possibility that any or all of them may in fact be of diverse origin¹¹.

The three sample books contain at least the following uses of Kenny's twenty four favoured particles/connectives. By no means all the uses separated in the list are actually 'distinct' according to the working definition suggested above; I shall reintroduce that point shortly (here I wish to avoid any argument about the correctness or usefulness of my definition; I shall also later want to employ parts of the fuller list of 'uses' for different purposes).

1. ἀλλά a. ἀλλά simple
 - a.i. ἀλλά following or preceding actual or implied negative
 - a.ii. ἀλλά introducing precisions/qualifications/distinctions in relation to a point preceding (no negative: including ἀλλ' ὅμως)
- b. ἀλλ' ἢ
- c. ἀλλά μὴν οὐδέ
- d. οὐ μὴν ἀλλά (... γε)
- e. οὐ μὴ μόνον ἀλλά (καί)
2. ἄν (including καὶ)¹²
 - a. with optative (participle, infinitive)
 - a.i. marking softened assertions
 - a.ii. other

10. This is not to say that analysis by books is necessary or unproblematical; see e.g. my detailed argument on ἢ in the next instalment. But problems of some sort will arise however samples are chosen; and it is simplest to use already existing divisions (the statistical tests employed of course allow for the difference in length between the three books).

11. This point will also be further discussed in a later instalment.

12. Kenny's figures for ἄν/καὶ in the sample books require some degree of revision. The total for NE IV should be 47 instead of his 50, which includes 2 cases of καὶ ἔάν and (apparently) 1 of καὶ ἔν: for AE A the figure should be 29 instead of Kenny's 34, which includes 1 καὶ ἔάν and 4 ἄν = ἔάν: for EE III the figure should be 29 for his 34, which includes 1 meaningless ἄν inside a conditional clause at 1233a27, to be excised (though to compensate we should add 1, at 1231b25, which as evidently slipped out of Susemihl's text), 1 καὶ ἔάν and 4 ἄν = ἔάν (of course ἄν = ἔάν and καὶ ἔάν themselves in a relevant sense represent cases of the use of ἄν; but if so, why exclude ὅταν and ἐπείν?). Other uses of ἄν/καὶ not included in my list of uses are: καὶ εἰ = 'even if' (once in AE A); ὥστε ἄν (καὶ) εἰ + optative (twice in AE A); and ὥς ἄν εἰ + optative (once in E III).

Adjustments of a similar kind will also be necessary for οἷον, where Kenny's figures include the irrelevant cases of οἷον in οἷόν τε (εἰναί) and οἷον = acc. masc. or neut. of οἷος correlative to τοιοῦτος (two examples of each in both NE IV and AE A). As also for τε, where we need to exclude not only τε in οἷόν τε, but also 3 examples

- b. with subjunctive
c. with imperfect indicative
d. with aorist indicative
3. γάρ a. γάρ simple
b. καὶ γάρ
 4. γέ a. γέ simple
b. with other particles/connectives (ἀλλὰ ... γέ, ἐπεὶ ... γέ, καίτοι ... γέ, οὐ μὴν ... γέ, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ ... γέ) (cf. also γούν)
 5. δέ a. δέ simple a.i. δέ connective
a.ii. δέ adversative
b. ... μὲν ... δέ ... (δέ ...)
c. δ'οὔν
 6. δὴ a. = 'then', 'therefore', etc.¹³
b. other uses of δὴ as connective
c. emphatic δὴ¹⁴
 7. διό ?a. = 'hence'
?b. = 'this is why'¹⁵
(cf. also διότι)
 8. εἰ a. in conditionals, including concessive καὶ εἰ, εἰ καί, καὶν εἰ, καὶν
a.i. εἰ, ἄν, (καὶν) with subjunctive¹⁶
a.ii. εἰ with optative
a.iii. with imperfect indicative
a.iv. with (aorist) indicative = 'if x had happened (which it did not)'¹⁷
a.v. with aorist indicative, other
a.vi. with present indicative = 'if A, (then B)', implying 'but A, therefore B'
a.vii. with present indicative, other
a.viii. with future indicative
a.ix. οἷον εἰ, ὥστε εἰ (introducing examples)
a.x. ὥστε ἄν (καὶν) εἰ = 'as if'
b. in indirect questions
 9. ἐπεὶ a. = 'since', 'if'
b. ἐπεὶ ... γέ (concessive sense)
(cf. also ἐπεί, 'whenever', and ἐπειδὴ)

of τε in εἰς τε in NE IV (since εἰς τε should presumably be counted as a variant of εἴτε), and 1 τε in a quotation, which is presumably irrelevant to Aristotelian usage (so too two γάρ in EE III, and an εἰ and an ἢ in AE A).

Further minor adjustments to Kenny's figures (errors due except where noted to misreading of his computer-based concordances, relevant parts of which he has kindly lent me in order to check differences between his totals and my hand-counted ones): ἀλλὰ in NE IV, 39 for 38; in EE III, 44 for 43 (one ἀλλὰ appearing as ἀλλὰ); γέ in AE A, 6 for 5; εἰ in AE A, 43 for 45 (two occurrences rightly bracketed by Bywater); ἢ in NE IV, 69 for 67; οὔτε in NE IV, 16 for 15; τε in EE III, 17 for 18 (?typographical error); ὥς in NE IV, 44 for 43 (Kenny's count omits the occurrence of ὥς in the admittedly mangled context 1127b12-13). At NE IV 1122a14 the words τε γάρ have apparently dropped out of the text scanned by the computer; but one may presume that errors of this kind will be rare (see also the case of ἀλλὰ above). I have not run complete checks on δέ, γάρ, καί, οὐ or μή, though I have roughly checked the figures for the first three, and any errors will be too small, given the large totals involved, to affect the argument. Most of the errors with respect to other items are also negligible; but the problems noted above with Kenny's figures for ἄν/καὶν, οἷον and τε in the sample books are clearly sufficient in themselves to throw doubt on the usefulness of all Kenny's figures for these items.

13. I.e. δὴ as equivalent of, or as weaker variant of, ἄρα, οὔν, etc..
14. Add 1 case of δὴ in the phrase ὁ τι δὴ ποτε (NE IV), and one possible case of καὶ δὴ καί (EE III 1229b2, where however we should probably read καὶ δὴ: 'καὶ post δὴ om. Π² et editores', Susemihl).
15. For comments on this division of the uses of διό see a later instalment.
16. Figures for these items are excluded from Kenny's totals for εἰ; but if any argument is to be based on gross totals, they ought evidently to be included: compare the case of ἄν, note 12 above.
17. One case only, in NE IV, = εἰ ᾤδεν (1137b23: 'if he had known ... ').

- 8 10. η a. comparative (including ἀλλ' η)
b. disjunctive
(cf. also η του)
11. (καθότι)
12. καί a. καί solo, connective
b. καί ... καί ('both ... and ...')
c. ... τε καί ... , ... τε ... καί ...
d. 'emphatic' καί, preceding word/phrase/clause marked off for emphasis (including καί = 'even', 'also'), or following other particle/connectives.
e. καί δὲ καί¹⁸
13. (μέν)
14. (μή)
15. οἷον a. = 'as for instance'
b. = 'as it were'
c. = 'viz.'
16. ὅτι a. = 'that'
b. = 'because'
(cf. also διότι)
17. (οὐ)
18. οὐδέ a. (not x) οὐδέ (y), including οὐ ... οὐδέ ... (and οὐδέ ... δέ) = strong 'nor'¹⁹
b. = 'not even', etc. (corresponding to καί, use d., including ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδέ, διό(περ) οὐδέ, ἐπεὶ οὐδέ, ὥστε οὐδέ
(cf. also μηδέ)²⁰
19. οὖν a. οὖν solo
b. μὲν οὖν
c. δ' οὖν
20. (οὔτε: cf. also μήτε)
21. τε a. ... τε καί ... (... τε ... καί ...)
b. ... τε ... τε ...
c. οὔτε (μήτε) ... τε ...
d. τε solo
22. ὥς a. relative of manner, as in ὥς δεῖ, etc.; including ὥς as in e.g. ὥς φαμέν, and in uses like e.g. ' x is regarded ὥς y ', ἐστὶν ... ἄλλη τις ἀδικία ὥς μέρος τῆς ὅλης, etc.
b. causal, usually with participle
c. 'limiting', as in ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, ὥς ἀληθῶς, etc.
d. in indirect questions
e. = ὅτι, 'that'
f. = 'as if'
23. (ὥστε)
24. ὥστε a. introducing consecutive clauses
b. as connective, like οὖν, ἀρα, etc.²¹
- Using the chi-squared test for regularity (Kenny pp.91ff.), the gross counts for the twenty-four items in the three sample books are irregular in the case of ἀλλὰ, γάρ, γε, δὲ, εἰ, ἐπεὶ, καί, ὅτι, οὐ, οὐδέ and ὥστε, and regular in all other cases²². In each case of
18. See note 14 above. 19. See a later instalment.
20. I shall argue below that οὐδέ and μηδέ (and οὔτε and μήτε) should properly be treated together.
21. In the case of some of the items listed, e.g. καί, ὥς, the breakdown by use could go further; I have stopped where I have because the lines between further subdivisions become less clear, and/or because I detect no real differences in usage in respect of these further subdivisions in the sample books (on causal ὥς however see below in a later instalment).
22. I use the chi-squared test because it is probably the simplest to apply. A 'regular' distribution in this context means that we need no explanation for any differences which it displays other than chance; an 'irregular' distribution means that it is one which is unlikely to have arisen by chance, and which is therefore likely to require some other explanation (which may be, but will not necessarily be, in terms of 'style'). The only difference between my application of the test and Kenny's is that he applies it only to NE, AE and EE separately, and to NE + AE and EE + AE, while I apply it across the board to parts of all three groups of books together. But this difference should be unimportant: by and large, if the test shows NE IV, AE A and EE III to be 'regular' in any given respect, this means that a combination of any two of the three is also regular; if they are 'irregular', by and large this means that one or more of NE IV + AE A, EE III + AE A and NE IV + EE III are also irregular, and normally it will

- b. with subjunctive
c. with imperfect indicative
d. with aorist indicative
3. γάρ a. γάρ simple
b. καὶ γάρ
 4. γε a. γε simple
b. with other particles/connectives (ἀλλά ... γε, ἐπεὶ ... γε, καίτοι ... γε, οὐ μὴν ... γε, οὐ μὴν ἀλλά ... γε) (cf. also γούν)
 5. δέ a. δέ simple a.i. δέ connective
a.ii. δέ adversative
b. ... μέν ... δέ ... (δέ ...)
c. δ'οὔν
 6. δὴ a. = 'then', 'therefore', etc.¹³
b. other uses of δὴ as connective
c. emphatic δὴ¹⁴
 7. διό ?a. = 'hence'
?b. = 'this is why'¹⁵
(cf. also διόπερ)
 8. εἰ a. in conditionals, including concessive καὶ εἰ, εἰ καί, κἂν εἰ, κἂν
a.i. εἰ, ἄν, (κἂν) with subjunctive¹⁶
a.ii. εἰ with optative
a.iii. with imperfect indicative
a.iv. with (aorist) indicative = 'if x had happened (which it did not)'¹⁷
a.v. with aorist indicative, other
a.vi. with present indicative = 'if A, (then B)', implying 'but A, therefore B'
a.vii. with present indicative, other
a.viii. with future indicative
a.ix. οὔτε εἰ, ὥστε εἰ (introducing examples)
a.x. ὥστε ἄν (κἂν) εἰ = 'as if'
b. in indirect questions
 9. ἐπεὶ a. = 'since', 'if'
b. ἐπεὶ ... γε (concessive sense)
(cf. also ἐπεί, 'whenever', and ἐπειδὴ)

of τε in εἰς τε in NE IV (since εἰς τε should presumably be counted as a variant of εἴτε), and 1 τε in a quotation, which is presumably irrelevant to Aristotelian usage (so too two γάρ in EE III, and an εἰ and an ἢ in AE A).

Further minor adjustments to Kenny's figures (errors due except where noted to misreading of his computer-based concordances, relevant parts of which he has kindly lent me in order to check differences between his totals and my hand-counted ones): ἀλλά in NE IV, 39 for 38; in EE III, 44 for 43 (one ἀλλά appearing as ἀλλὰ); γε in AE A, 6 for 5; εἰ in AE A, 43 for 45 (two occurrences rightly bracketed by Bywater); ἢ in NE IV, 69 for 67; οὔτε in NE IV, 16 for 15; τε in EE III, 17 for 18 (?typographical error); ὥς in NE IV, 44 for 43 (Kenny's count omits the occurrence of ὥς in the admittedly mangled context 1127b12-13). At NE IV 1122a14 the words τε γάρ have apparently dropped out of the text scanned by the computer; but one may presume that errors of this kind will be rare (see also the case of ἀλλά above). I have not run complete checks on δέ, γάρ, καί, οὐ or μή, though I have roughly checked the figures for the first three, and any errors will be too small, given the large totals involved, to affect the argument. Most of the errors with respect to other items are also negligible; but the problems noted above with Kenny's figures for ἄν/κἂν, οὔτε and τε in the sample books are clearly sufficient in themselves to throw doubt on the usefulness of all Kenny's figures for these items.

13. I.e. δὴ as equivalent of, or as weaker variant of, ὅρα, οὔν, etc..
14. Add 1 case of δὴ in the phrase ὁ τε δὴ ποτε (NE IV), and one possible case of καὶ δὴ καί (EE III 1229b2, where however we should probably read καὶ δὴ: 'καὶ post δὴ om. Π² et editores', Susemihl).
15. For comments on this division of the uses of διό see a later instalment.
16. Figures for these items are excluded from Kenny's totals for εἰ; but if any argument is to be based on gross totals, they ought evidently to be included: compare the case of ἄν, note 12 above.
17. One case only, in NE IV, = εἰ ἤδει (1137b23: 'if he had known ... ').

- 8 10. η a. comparative (including $\alpha\lambda\lambda'\eta$)
b. disjunctive
(cf. also $\eta\tau\omicron\iota$)
11. ($\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho$)
12. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ a. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ solo, connective
b. $\kappa\alpha\iota \dots \kappa\alpha\iota$ ('both ... and ...')
c. $\dots \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \dots, \dots \tau\epsilon \dots \kappa\alpha\iota \dots$
d. 'emphatic' $\kappa\alpha\iota$, preceding word/phrase/clause marked off for emphasis (including $\kappa\alpha\iota$ = 'even', 'also'), or following other particle/connectives.
e. $\kappa\alpha\iota \delta\eta \kappa\alpha\iota$ ¹⁸
13. ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$)
14. ($\mu\grave{\eta}$)
15. $\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ a. = 'as for instance'
b. = 'as it were'
c. = 'viz.'
16. $\delta\tau\iota$ a. = 'that'
b. = 'because'
(cf. also $\delta\iota\acute{o}\tau\iota$)
17. ($\omicron\upsilon$)
18. $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ a. (not x) $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (y), including $\omicron\upsilon \dots \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon} \dots$ (and $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon} \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$) = strong 'nor'¹⁹
b. = 'not even', etc. (corresponding to $\kappa\alpha\iota$, use d., including $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \mu\grave{\eta}\nu \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\delta\iota\acute{o}(\pi\epsilon\rho) \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$
(cf. also $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$)²⁰
19. $\omicron\upsilon\grave{\nu}$ a. $\omicron\upsilon\grave{\nu}$ solo
b. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\upsilon\grave{\nu}$
c. $\delta'\omicron\upsilon\grave{\nu}$
20. ($\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$: cf. also $\mu\grave{\eta}\tau\epsilon$)
21. $\tau\epsilon$ a. $\dots \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \dots$ ($\dots \tau\epsilon \dots \kappa\alpha\iota \dots$)
b. $\dots \tau\epsilon \dots \tau\epsilon \dots$
c. $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ ($\mu\grave{\eta}\tau\epsilon$) $\dots \tau\epsilon \dots$
d. $\tau\epsilon$ solo
22. $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ a. relative of manner, as in $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\epsilon\iota$, etc.; including $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ as in e.g. $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \varphi\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, and in uses like e.g. ' x is regarded $\acute{\omega}\varsigma y$ ', $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \dots \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta \tau\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha \acute{\omega}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, etc.
b. causal, usually with participle
c. 'limiting', as in $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \tau\omicron \pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, etc.
d. in indirect questions
e. = $\delta\tau\iota$, 'that'
f. = 'as if'
23. ($\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$)
24. $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ a. introducing consecutive clauses
b. as connective, like $\omicron\upsilon\grave{\nu}$, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$, etc.²¹

Using the chi-squared test for regularity (Kenny pp.91ff.), the gross counts for the twenty-four items in the three sample books are irregular in the case of $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\gamma\epsilon$, $\delta\eta$, $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$, $\delta\tau\iota$, $\omicron\upsilon$, $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$, and regular in all other cases²². In each case of

18. See note 14 above.

19. See a later instalment.

20. I shall argue below that $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (and $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ and $\mu\grave{\eta}\tau\epsilon$) should properly be treated together.

21. In the case of some of the items listed, e.g. $\kappa\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, the breakdown by use could go further; I have stopped where I have because the lines between further subdivisions become less clear, and/or because I detect no real differences in usage in respect of these further subdivisions in the sample books (on causal $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ however see below in a later instalment).

22. I use the chi-squared test because it is probably the simplest to apply. A 'regular' distribution in this context means that we need no explanation for any differences which it displays other than chance; an 'irregular' distribution means that it is one which is unlikely to have arisen by chance, and which is therefore likely to require some other explanation (which may be, but will not necessarily be, in terms of 'style'). The only difference between my application of the test and Kenny's is that he applies it only to NE, AE and EE separately, and to NE + AE and EE + AE, while I apply it across the board to parts of all three groups of books together. But this difference should be unimportant: by and large, if the test shows NE IV, AE A and EE III to be 'regular' in any given respect, this means that a combination of any two of the three is also regular; if they are 'irregular', by and large this means that one or more of NE IV + AE A, EE III + AE A and NE IV + EE III are also irregular, and normally it will

irregularity bar one, the incidence of the item in AE A is proportionately closer to its incidence in EE III than to its incidence in NE IV (the exception is $\sigma\upsilon$). Use by use, the pattern is as follows (I single out all irregularities, and the interesting regularities).

1. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$ a. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ simple, irregular²³: the figures for other uses are negligible²⁴
3. $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ a. $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ simple, irregular
b. $\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, regular²⁵
4. $\gamma\epsilon$ It is perhaps doubtful whether the distinction shown above (4.a. and 4.b.) is really helpful, i.e. whether in any sense $\gamma\epsilon$ with other particles/connectives should be separated from $\gamma\epsilon$ simple (except in the case of $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota \dots \gamma\epsilon$); but we shall later notice a feature of the use of simple $\gamma\epsilon$ in NE IV: it is also worth noting five occurrences of $\sigma\upsilon \mu\eta\nu \dots \gamma\epsilon$ in NE IV, against none in either of the other two books, which is by itself sufficient to account from the irregularity of the gross totals²⁶
5. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ a. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ simple, irregular a.i. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ connective, regular²⁷
a.ii. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ adversative, irregular²⁸
6. $\delta\eta$ a. (cases that are certain), NE IV 14 / AE A 5 / EE III 4, i.e. regular
b. (" " " "), 1 / 1 / 2 (figures negligible)
c. (" " " "), 4²⁹ / 2 / 1 (again negligible)

But we have to add here 6 cases where disagreement between manuscripts is marked by the editor (4 in NE IV, 2 in AE A); a further 6 cases where $\delta\eta$ is due to the editor (3 in NE IV, 2 in AE A, 1 in EE III); 1 or 2 cases where $\delta\eta$ is

be obvious which of them it is (I add the caution 'by and large' because some fuzziness may appear where we approach or pass by a small measure the value declared by the statistical tables to be significant at the chosen - in this case 1% - confidence-level). My intention is merely to reduce testing procedures to the minimum necessary. Two further points. Firstly, I do not intend to imply whole-hearted acceptance of Kenny's statistical methods as such; it is only that if we are interested at all in patterns of distribution, we obviously need some rule of thumb for distinguishing between those patterns which may require investigation, and those which do not. The chi-squared test will provide this sort of rule; others might have done so just as well. Secondly, it may sometimes be the case that patterns of distribution which appear as regular in the sample books would show up as irregular if repeated over a larger number of books; alternatively, other combinations of books might well display different regularities and irregularities. But the sorts of considerations which will be found to apply to regularities and irregularities as such in the sample books will in principle apply to any analogous regularities and irregularities which are discovered over any grouping of books, whether small or large.

23. The precise figures are: NE IV, 34; AE A, 80; EE III, 41 (including 1234a9, where Spengel conjectures $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \eta$ for $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$).
24. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \eta$, 2 / 4 / 1 (2); $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \mu\eta\nu \sigma\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, 0 / 1 /); $\sigma\upsilon/\mu\eta \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} (\kappa\alpha\iota)$, 1 / 3 / 1; $\sigma\upsilon \mu\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} (\dots \gamma\epsilon)$, 2 / 0 / 1.
25. 165 / 127 / 89; 6 / 6 / 13.
26. $\gamma\epsilon$ simple, 7 / 3 / 2; $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \dots \gamma\epsilon$, 1 / 1 / 0; $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota \dots \gamma\epsilon$, 1 / 0 / 0; $\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\iota \dots \gamma\epsilon$, 0 / 2 / 1; $\sigma\upsilon \mu\eta\nu \dots \gamma\epsilon$, 5 / 0 / 0, $\sigma\upsilon \mu\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \dots \gamma\epsilon$, 1 / 0 / 0 ($\gamma\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu$, 2 / 0 / 1).
27. I give two separate sets of figures for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ simple: 1) 226 / 191 / 132; 2) 223 / 184 / 119. 1) represents Kenny's totals for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, less one for each occurrence of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ answering $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ (and less an additional one in the case of NE IV for the solitary instance of $\delta' \sigma\upsilon\nu$); 2) is the result of my hand-count. 1) is inaccurate to the extent that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is sometimes answered by more than one $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, especially in EE III, while 2) is liable to the inaccuracy which is inherent in hand-counting, particularly in the case of very common items; but together they give us upper and lower limits. Both sets of figures are in any case irregular by the usual test.
28. My counts give totals of 128 / 114 / 82 for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ connective, and of 88 / 70 / 37 for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ adversative. (The figures for NE IV exclude 7 special cases of the pattern $\kappa\alpha\iota \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, i.e. where $\kappa\alpha\iota$ cannot easily be treated as 'emphatic', which are difficult to interpret, but which I hesitantly treat as combinations of connective $\kappa\alpha\iota$ with redundant $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. Professor David Balme tells me that this pattern occurs roughly once every fifty lines in the *Historia animalium*; it is clearly a feature which requires independent investigation, both in Aristotle and in other fourth-century authors). I confess that for a variety of reasons I am less certain about these sets of totals than about any others; but I am satisfied that they are at least tolerably accurate, and in any case not much will hang on them.
29. Or 3: 1122a12 $\kappa\alpha\iota \dots \delta\eta$ bears a suspicious resemblance to the cases of $\kappa\alpha\iota \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ referred to in the preceding note.

10

doubtful for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (NE IV); and 2 cases (again in NE IV) where at least one manuscript reads $\delta\eta$, or the editor suggests, but does not write, $\delta\eta$. In this confused situation not much can be derived from any of the figures, though plainly NE IV shows a degree of liking for use a. (= 'then', 'therefore', etc.) by contrast with both AE A and EE III³⁰.

8. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ a. in conditionals, irregular
 a.i. $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ with subjunctive, regular
 a.vii. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ with present indicative, other, also regular
 Figures otherwise too small for the application of the test³¹
9. $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ a. = 'since', 'if', irregular
 Figures otherwise negligible³²
10. η Both a. comparative, and b. disjunctive, irregular³³
12. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ a. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ solo, connective, irregular: other uses regular³⁴
16. $\delta\tau\iota$ Both a. = 'that', and b. = 'because', regular³⁵
18. $\circ\delta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ Both a. = strong 'nor', and b. = 'not even', etc., regular³⁶
24. $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ b. connective, irregular
 a. introducing consecutive clauses, figures negligible³⁷

We need now to consider precisely how this new set of irregularities and regularities may affect Kenny's arguments. In the cases of $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ and $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$, we merely locate irregularity in a particular use ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ simple, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ adversative, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ in conditionals³⁸, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ = 'since', 'if', $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ connective, $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ connective: so too in a sense

30. One unanswered question is how far similar uncertainties are likely to affect the counts for other particles and connectives; they are as a class particularly liable to corruption in transmission. It is some small comfort that at least the abbreviated *apparatus* of the editors suggest that in other cases the problems may be comparatively minor; but in general it is an issue which probably deserves more attention than I have accorded it.
31. 8.a. in conditionals, including $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$, etc., totals, 21 / 55 / 34: a.i., 6 / 11 / 8; a.ii., 3 / 6 / 4; a.iii., 1 / 2 / 3; a.iv., 0 / 1 / 0; a.v., 2 / 11 / 0; a.vi., 1 / 4 / 1; a.vii., 4 / 17 / 14 (the last figure including one case of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ + perfect indicative); a.viii., 1 / 0 / 0; a.ix., 3 / 1 / 4 (excluding AE A 1129a25 and EE III 1228b13, classed under a.vi. and a.vii. respectively, but including EE IIIa2); a.x., 0 / 2 / 0.
32. 9.a. = 'since', 'if', 1 / 10 / 11; b. $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$... $\gamma\epsilon$, 1 / 0 / 0; $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$, 0 / 1 / 0; $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, 0 / 0 / 1 (this last item may be more important elsewhere: e.g. in NE 1, it substitutes for $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ - as it does in its single occurrence in EE III - four times).
33. 10.a. comparative, 29 / 9 / 14; b. disjunctive, 40 / 81 / 46 ($\eta\tau\omicron\iota$, 0 / 0 / 2). (Figures for $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\eta$, included in the first set of totals, 2 / 4 / 1).
34. Gross totals for $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$, 440 (435) / 362 (348) / 312 (282). The first figures in each case are Kenny's, while the bracketed figures represent the sums of my counts for particular uses (see below), plus one for each occurrence of the pattern $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ (and one for the solitary, disputed, occurrence of $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$: see n.15 above). The differences are due partly to the fact that I have counted occurrences of $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... (...) and ... $\tau\epsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ ($\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$) ... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... (...) as simple occurrences of $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... and ... $\tau\epsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$...; partly also, no doubt, they reflect inaccuracy in my counts (see on $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ nn.27 & 28 above). (Kenny's figures are also to some degree suspect, at least to the extent that they appear to exclude cases like $\kappa\alpha\acute{\nu}$) But the discrepancies are so small in relation to the size of the totals that they can be discounted. Totals for particular uses: a. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ solo, connective, 302 (including the 7 cases referred to n.29 above) / 216 / 181; b. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$..., 15 / 13 / 12; c. ... $\tau\epsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$... (... $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$...), 13 / 22 / 16; d. 'emphatic' $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$, 90 / 84 / 59; $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$, 0 / 0 / ?1.
35. 16.a. = 'that', 12 / 30 / 12 (chi-squared = 8.18, where a value of 9.21 would be significant at the chosen level); b. = 'because', 4 / 15 / 8 (chi-squared = 6.24). ($\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$, 0 / 1 / 1)
36. a. (not x) $\circ\delta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (y), 27 / 12 / 9 (chi-squared = 9.11); b. = 'not even', etc., 16 / 8 / 8 (chi-squared = 3.71). (Figure for EE III excludes 1233a21, where Spengel, probably rightly, conjectures $\circ\delta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ for $\circ\delta\tau\epsilon$) ($\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, 3 / 5 / 2; 0 / 0 / 1)
37. b. as connective, 2 / 22 / 10; a. introducing consecutive clauses, 2 / 1 / 2 (the distinguishing mark of the latter use being that $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ answers to an actual or implied $\delta\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$, $\tau\omicron\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, etc.).
38. If we further subdivide into types of conditionals, however, the irregularity disappears altogether: see above, with n.31, and further in the next instalment.

with γε. δὲ presents what may be special problems. The remaining cases, however, do appear more disturbing for Kenny, i.e. those of ἤ (a gross regularity compounded from two irregularities, both of which tend to isolate AE E rather than NE IV), and οὐ and οὐδέ (gross irregularities compounded from regularities). In each of these three cases, that we are dealing with distinct uses³⁹ is scarcely in doubt; they therefore serve to flesh out the theoretical objections which I raised earlier to Kenny's methods. We may add, of course, that similar problems might in principle arise with any item possessing distinct uses if we compare different books from the three groups, or the three groups as wholes⁴⁰. I list the following uses of other items as clearly distinct (in the sense defined): in the apodotes of conditional sentences / with subjunctive / with optative marking softened assertions; δέ connective / adversative⁴¹ / in δ' οὐ; εἰ in conditional sentences / in indirect questions; ἐπεὶ / ἐπεὶ ... γε / (ἐπὶ = 'whenever'); καὶ connective / emphatic / in καὶ δὲ καὶ; οἷον = 'as for instance' / = 'as it were' / = 'viz.'; οὐ solo / μὲν οὐ (δ' οὐ); ὡς relative / causal / 'limiting' / in indirect questions / = ὅτι / = 'as if'. The counts for some of these subdivisions in the sample books are admittedly very small; but for a considerable number they are quite large enough to be a potential source of trouble for Kenny⁴².

Some special remarks should be made here about four items in Kenny's list: οὐ, μή, οὐδέ and οὐτε. First οὐ and μή. Barring certain immediately obvious, and perhaps quirkish, stylistic possibilities (e.g. a fondness for double negatives), it is not intuitively clear that the frequency of negatives will in general serve as any sort of discriminator of style; and if it does, we would need, especially in the case of Greek texts, to take into account compound as well as simple negatives. This latter point is by itself sufficient to undermine any argument based on irregularities in the distribution of οὐ and μή simple (οὐ, as we saw, turned out to be irregular in the sample books; on Kenny's figures, it is also irregular in NE and EE taken as wholes, while μή simple is irregular in NE). A count which included compounds as well as simple negatives might, on the other hand, be relevant for stylometric purposes, in the following ways.

The important roles of μή and its compounds in Aristotle, if we judge by the three sample books, are 1) in the marking of an idea as generic; 2) as the appropriate negative in certain syntactical contexts. I shall consider 1) a little later; 2) is in any case (again on the strength of my samples) the most frequent role of μή and compounds. If so, a count of μή and compounds will mainly be a count of the number of occasions on which the relevant syntactical contexts occur in negative form, and this total may bear some relation to the total number of occurrences of those contexts, which may well interest the stylometrist; though plainly he would be better off in that case counting the contexts in question directly. Alternatively, a particular text might show a special predilection for the heaping up of negatives, though perhaps we should expect this normally to be a matter of opportunity.

In general, I find no differences in these directions in the sample books; but see further below. 1) οὐδέ: there is probably a case for including with the figures for οὐδέ those for μηδέ, since μηδέ can be regarded simply as a variant of οὐδέ under certain special conditions (i.e. in particular syntactical contexts: see above). The figures for μηδέ in the sample books are very small⁴³, and hardly affect the issue there; but in principle they should be taken into account.

2) οὐτε: if we should add together the figures for οὐδέ and μηδέ, so presumably we should for οὐτε and μήτε; and at least in the sample books the figures for μήτε are not negligible. But there is a further important point about οὐτε/μήτε. οὐτες and μήτες tend to hunt in groups of two or more; the decision to use οὐτε or μήτε will normally entail its appearing at least once more. What we need to count is therefore not single occurrences of either word, but groups of occurrences. This is important, because it will have the effect of removing the apparent irregularity in the use of οὐτε, by Kenny's count, in both NE and EE⁴⁴. (What the position would be with regard to combined totals for οὐτε and μήτε I do not know; μήτε generally appears too infrequently to be included in Kenny's list).

39. See pp.4-5 above.

40. See n.22 above

41. Including both δέ simple adversative and δέ answering to μὲν

42. So e.g. in the case of οὐ: οὐ solo, 24 / 20 / 8; μὲν οὐ, 7 / 12 / 9 (δ' οὐ, 1 / 0 / 0. (A small question mark perhaps needs to be placed over the figures for μὲν οὐ, since it is not always easy to decide between those cases where μὲν οὐ is to be treated as a unit, and those where each of the two particles retains its separate force. But I hope that my decisions are at least relatively judicious.

43. See n.36 above.

44. For the sample books, the figures are: οὐτε, 8 groups of 2 / 1 of 3, 8 of 2, 1 οὐτε ... τε ... / 1 of 4, 2 of 3, 7 of 2, + 1233a21 (see n.37 above); μήτε, 3 of 2, 1 μήτε ... τε ... / 1 of 4, 1 of 3, 2 of 2 / 2 of 3, 1 of 2. Assuming that the normal distribution is 2 οὐτες per group, NE will give, book by book, 8 / 8 / 6 / 8 / 2 (assuming one group of 3, to emphasize the smallness of the figures here) / 2 / 2 (again assuming one group of 3); and EE & (or 6) / 10 / 13 / 11 / 1 (chi-squared = 13.20, 6.48 (7.89), a value of 16.81 being significant at the chosen level for 6 degrees of freedom, and 13.8 for 4 degrees).

Review: T.P. WISEMAN (Exeter):

LCM 8.1 (Jan. 1983), 12

Brian Arkins, *Sexuality in Catullus* (Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien, Band VIII, Georg Olms, Hildesheim 1982. pp. x + 260. ISBN 3 487 07277 7).

Two out of every three Catullan poems, Dr Arkins avers, deal with some form of sexual behaviour. 'Yet although Catullus is intensely preoccupied with sexual themes, no comprehensive analysis of sexuality in his work exists and this book is intended to remedy that deficiency.' Dr Arkins offers judicious comment and up-to-date bibliography on 79 of the 116 poems in the *liber Catulli*, in four chapters as follows:

I. Provincial and Roman Themes. Section 1, relating to Catullus' 'provincial base in Cisalpine Gaul': poems 17, 59, 67, 100, 110, 111. Section 2, on the effect of Caesar wintering at Verona: poems 57, 29 (reading *urbis opulentissime* in line 23, with reference to Crassus), 94, 41 (with the 10,000 HS the price of Aemilia's favours), 42. Section 3, on the *urbani* at Rome: poems 45, 6, 55, 10, 32, 56 (addressed to Marcus Cato, and reading *puellam* in line 5). Section 4, on the common ground of love and poetry: poems 50, 35, 68a (Manlius asking for neoteric poetry as 'vicarious sexual gratification'), 96. Sections 5-6, the 'sick society' as revealed in the epigrams, first Gellius and then the rest: poems 74, 80, 88, 89, 90; 69, 71, 97, 78, 113, 33 (evidently as an honorary member of the 65-116 collection), 106, 112.

II. Lesbia. Section 1, social-historical background; section 2, identification (arguing for Clodia Metelli); section 3, why 'Lesbia'? (with sensible comments on the significance of Sappho - nothing to do with *λεσβιάζειν*). Section 4, on her attractions for Catullus: poems 43, 86. Section 5, the initial meeting: poems 51 (omitting the last stanza), 68b. 63-76. Section 6, how they viewed their love: poems 72, 58.2-3, 87, 76.1-9, 68b. 131-148, 70, 109. Section 7, the early stages of the affair: poems 8.3-8, 107, 83, 92, 7, 36, 13 (obscene interpretation of *unguentum* rejected), 5 (showing 'definite unease or an undercurrent of unhappiness'), 2, 3 (obscene interpretation of *passer* 'may point to a secondary level of meaning'). Section 8, on the rivals for her love: poems 8, 76 (the similarities with the vocabulary of poem 51 are relegated to a footnote), 72, 75, 85. Section 10, the rejection: poems 104, 37, 58, 11.

III. Juventus. Section 1 on poem 16 (taken as an announcement that the Juvenus poems are not to be taken seriously, 'but function as witty *jeux d'esprit* which provide vicarious gratification'). Section 2 on Juvenus, Furius and Aurelius as real persons. Section 3: poems 15, 21, 24, 81, 40 (where *meos amores* is taken as referring to Juvenus). Section 4, on the kiss poems: 48, 99 (an 'occasional experiment' untypical of the 65-116 group).

IV. Marriage. Section 1, introduction on the paradox of the poet of *furtivus amor* celebrating the ideals of marriage. Section 2: poem 61. Section 3: Peleus and Thetis in poem 64. Section 4: poems 62, 65, 66. Section 5: Ariadne and Theseus in poem 64. Section 6: poem 63 (with Attis 'married' to Cybele 'in a perverted sense of the term').

At the end of chapter II, Dr Arkins completes his discussion of the Lesbia poems with a comment on the last stanza of poem 11: 'With this damning indictment of Lesbia as a destructive, promiscuous woman from whose clutches Catullus has finally freed himself the last Lesbia-poem ends. There is nothing more to be said.' But there is - 105 more poems, of which at least twenty refer to Lesbia, ten of them by name. It is, of course, common enough to ignore the order of the poems in the collection, and thus (as I think) lose the overall effect designed by the poet himself; but those who do so must recognize their motives in re-ordering and re-categorizing the poems. Despite the brave words in his introduction, Dr Arkins seems to me to be at heart an old-style biographical critic, confident that he knows which is the first Lesbia poem and which the last, and really interested more in the progress of love than in sex as such.

That means that his book falls between two stools. If it were actually an analysis of Catullus' emotional life, and above all of the way he presents the relationship with Lesbia, then it would have to deal with friendship (notoriously close to sexual love in Catullus' value system), and discuss such poems as 9, 12, 14, 30, 38 and 60 along with those dealt with in chapter II. If on the other hand it were really the comprehensive analysis of sexuality it purports to be, then half the poems that are discussed could be ignored as lacking specifically sexual content, and attention directed instead at obscene invectives like poems 25 and 28. As it happens, Dr Arkins has been unlucky on both counts, since his book has to compete in the first category with Eve Adler, *Catullan Self-Revelation* (Arno Press 1961), and in the second with J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (Duckworth 1982), which contains much of interest to students of Catullus.

In a note on Ovid, Met.3.155 *vallis erat piceis et acuta densa cupressu* in my Bristol Classical Press edition of that book (1979, repr. 1981) I wrote that *acuta* had to be taken ἀπό κοινού with both *piceis* and *cupressu*, adding that while the epithet described the sharp leaves of the former species very well, it did not fit those of the latter. "Either Ovid has been a little careless, or we are to interpret the adj. differently with *cupressu*, as 'tapering'". Ovid, of course, knew what he was about. In presuming that *acuta* referred to leaf-shape, as it always does elsewhere in Ovid when applied to plants², I allowed myself to be unduly influenced by Bömer ad loc.: '*acutus ist als Epitheton für Nadelbäume nicht ungewöhnlich ... , für cupressus aber, merkwürdigerweise, singulär. Der Zweifel Theol. I 464, 24f. über unsere Stelle scheint nicht berechtigt.*' The *Thesaurus* in fact assigns the present instance to the section *de arboribus, herbis*, subsection *folia*, but with a query, whether it might not be better transferred to the following section, headed *generaliter de rebus in aedem desinentibus* (e.g. hills, or a pyramid). Bömer appears to accept that Ovid envisaged both species of conifers as having needles. Many modern translators and annotators, too, are content with 'sharp-needed cypress trees' or the like. But the natural and obvious meaning of *acuta cupressus* is 'pointed' or 'tapering cypress' ('à la cime pointue', G.Lafaye, Budé edn., Paris 1928). The epithet may have come from Ovid himself (a keen gardener, who planted fruit trees and had pines on his land³, he might be expected to have had first-hand knowledge of *piceae* and *cupressus*), but is perhaps more likely to have a literary origin, in Theocritus, *Idyll* 11.45 ἐντὶ δάφναι τινεῖ, ἐντὶ βαθυαὶ καμπύλοισι. The Cyclops is here enumerating the amenities, vegetative and other, of his cave. This particular poem is one with which Ovid was intimately familiar (cf. his telling of the Polyphemus-story in Met.13). As for the principal of ἀπό κοινού, there is no reason why it should not still apply, although the result will be quite different. One cannot extract the sense 'sharp-leaved' retrospectively; so the *piceae* too must be 'pointed'. Now the cypress is the tree that tapers *par excellence*, but the 'pitch pine' (assuming the correctness of its accepted identification) also exhibits a narrowly conical or pyramidal habit⁴. The problem, therefore, which would have been a real one had Ovid written (as he could not) *vallis erat piceis acutis densa et cupressu* disappears.

1. *picea* = *Picea abies* (L.) Karsten, subspecies *abies* (formerly *P. excelsa* [Lam.] Link), the Norway Spruce, or 'pitch pine' of commentators. Lewis & Short wrongly identify *picea* with the Scots Fir, *Pinus sylvestris* L., which in S.Europe is a montane species only. See J.André, *Lexique de termes de botanique en latin* (Paris, Klingseck, 1956), s.v. *picea* *Flora Europaea*, vol.1 (CUP 1964), p.31. *cupressus* = *C. sempervirens* L., the Italian or Funeral Cypress.
2. Met.1.699 (*pinus*), Her.5.137 (ditto), AA.2.424 (ditto), Met.4.299 (*acuta cuspidi iunci*). *pinus* generally = either *Pinus pinea* L., the Umbrella or Stone Pine, or *P. halepensis* Mill., the Aleppo Pine.
3. ex P. 1.8.41-8, cf. 4.2.43f..
4. Illustrations in O.Polunin, *Trees and Bushes of Europe* (OUP 1976), pp.24 & 6 respectively (habit); id., *The Concise Flowers of Europe* (OUP 1972), plates 2.11 & 1.2. respectively.

Copyright (C) 1983 A.A.R.Henderson

I offer an alternative scenario for this petition - temerarily, because the proposal involves readings. (The reader will make little of this note unless he has before him the *ed. princeps* by J.D.Thomas in *Papyri Greek and Egyptian Edited by Various Hands in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner* ... [P.Turner], London, Egypt Exploration Society, 1981, at pp.148 ff. with pl. xiv) The text is a stage in some quarrel about an inheritance, but the editor's notes are candid as to the difficulties that subsist in deciding exactly what it is about, and what was laid down in the imperial edict to which it refers. It contains a word, [ἐπ]ερχόμενος, to which neither the editor nor the scholars he has consulted can give a plausible meaning.

Where to begin? Perhaps with the observation that imperial edicts were not needed to secure such results as that a will that failed either to institute or to disinherit sons would be void, or that a will held *inofficiosum* by the courts was *pro tanto* void: things of that sort were the case *ipso iure*. Where you expect to get an edict is in order to make illegal something that has hitherto not been illegal or void, because it has come to be regarded as wrong and requiring repression. I suggest that what the Severans - or conceivably some earlier emperor - sought to repress in the edict quoted in this petition was a practice of testamentary heirs (not being *sui et necessarii*) to delay interminably their acceptance or rejection of inheritance - for various purposes such as frustration of creditors and legatees or

tax avoidance. The edict is said by the petitioner to have made void (ἀ[κυρο]ῦσαν, on the one hand (μέν), X, and to have validated (βεβαιόσαν) on the other (δέ), Y. Y is then said to be 'when someone justly and lawfully takes possession of his appropriate share and duly registers it in the property register'. It should follow that X is when someone fails to do that. The editor gives the text of the petitioner's quotation of the edict as follows:

ἀ[κυρο]ῦσαν μὲν τὸ παράνομον βούλημα τοῦ | [ὡς πα]τρός διαθήκας [ὑπ]ερχόνους
καταλείποντος βεβαιόσαν δὲ | [εἰ υἱός] δικαίως καὶ ἐννό[μως] τὸ [διδόν] μέρος
κείμενα[ι] ἀπογραφόμενος | καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπὶ τόπων [βιβ]λιαφυλάκιον τῶν ἐνικήσεων.

Now [ὡς πα]τρός is very odd and unsatisfactory, and, as will certainly have occurred to the editor, the obvious supplement is [τὰς πα]τρός, but that supplement, of course, yields no sense so long as you are thinking of καταλείπειν as meaning what it very regularly does mean, to leave an inheritance. That, however, is not the only thing καταλείπειν can mean (and it is on the assumption that it does mean that that nobody can find a satisfactory sense for [ὑπ]ερχόνους). I offer for consideration the suggestion that τὰς πατρός διαθήκας ὑπερχόνους καταλείπειν might mean to leave the parental testament undealt with, in limbo, neither entered upon nor rejected, 'beyond time', i.e. beyond either some fixed or all reasonable time. (If a time for acceptance was laid down in the will, of course, you would have to make up your mind within that time, or else ... well, or else what? If there was a substitute heir named he would then come in, but suppose there was not? And how about *bonorum possessio*? And how about the situation where there is only one heir and no closing date for acceptance has been specified by the testator? There came a time when creditors could put pressure on an heir to decide within a time limit; but a look at Girard-Senn, *Manuel Élémentaire de Droit Romain*⁸, pp.929-933, the best account of what is known, will show that not all is clear, particularly as to how far the law had got at the particular epoch of this petition - A.D. 216.)

The petitioner forwards to the court a copy of the edict in order to show that he is not in breach of it, since he has accepted δεσποτεία, *dominium*, title, of his father's estate and fulfilled all the tax requirements. But that is only an opening salvo. What is he actually petitioning about? His father's widow, he asserts, has seized the νόμη (*possessio* as opposed to δεσποτεία, *dominium*) of part of the inheritance - the house and the money, basically - so that he had a job to take an inventory. On what ground has she done this? The editor prints ἐπειδήπερ | [ἐ]λ[αβ]εν ἐκ διαθήκων παράνομον κατάλειψιν. With respect to the editor and the late Professor Youtie, and with diffidence, I think that the photograph at least would justify the reading παράνομον (cf. the same word in line 5), and the reading [ἐ]ν[εμά]λει in place of [ἐ]λ[αβ]εν ἐκ. I would suppose κατάλειψις to be in this context a literal equivalent of *derelictio*.

The resultant text I would translate; 'when she had raised an allegation of illegal neglect of the testament' (i.e. failure of the heir to accept or reject). The lady may have been legatee or usufructuary (χορηγεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς, line 19) or both, and may have become disinclined to wait further upon the procrastinations of the petitioner. It is true that he describes it as his purpose to recover possession of the whole estate. He would be legally obliged to pay legacies and make over a usufruct; presumably he wants to get possession so as to be in a position to dispute the size of the legacy or the extent of the usufruct. Alternatively, the lady has perhaps tried on something in the nature of the old *usucapio* (*luorativa*) *pro herede* (Gaius, *Inst.* II.52-57). Gaius states that a *senatus consultum* of Hadrian's time had removed its teeth by making it petitionable against by the heir: maybe that is just what this petition is, an *hereditatis petitio*. And as a very bold final conjecture one might hazard that after the Hadrianic *senatus consultum* had drawn the teeth of *usucapio pro herede* heirs found it easier to be dilatory, and someone, very likely the Severans, had to pass some new rule setting some limit of time to their procrastinations on pain of not being allowed to petition against an *usucapio pro herede*.

Copyright (C) 1983 J.A.Crook

YVAN NADEAU (Arts Faculty Office, Edinburgh): *Juvenal traduced* (Juvenal 2.149-159)

LCM 8.1 (Jan.1983), 14-16

1. Juvenal, in his second satire, writes thus about pathic homosexuals:

esse aliquos manes et subterranea regna
Cooytum et Stygio ranas in gurgite nigras, 150
atque una transire uadum tot milia cumba
nec pueri credunt, nisi qui nondum aere lauantur.
sed tu uera puta: Curius quid sentit et ambo
Soipiadae, quid Fabricius manesque Camilli,
quid Cremerae legio et Carnis consumpta iuuentus, 155
tot bellorum animae, quotiens hinc talis ad illos
umbra uenit? cuperent lustrari, si qua darentur
sulpura cum taedis et si foret umida laurus.
illio heu miseri traducimur. 2.149-159

About the word *traducimur* Braund and Cloud write in *LCM* 6.8(Oct.1981), 195-208 at 207: 15
 'For *traducere* denotes the public parading of captives through Rome in the ceremony of the triumph (as Anderson, 50, and Courtney, ad loc., observe): here it is Romans who are disgraced by other Romans.

Courtney¹, consulted, adduces the evidence of 7.16, 8.17, 11.31. In all three passages *traducere* has the sense classified by the *OLD* as 4b, i.e. 'to expose to scorn or obloquy'

- 7.16 *altera quos nudo traducit gallica talo*
 8.16-17 *si tenerum attritus Catinensi pumic lumbum*
 11.30-31 *squalentis traducit quos*
neque enim loricae poscit Achillis

Thersitis, in qua se traducebat Ulixes

Do Braund, Cloud, Courtney, mean that *traducere* in the passage of Juvenal 2 quoted above bears two meanings, is a kind of pun? If so, what in the surrounding context supports the reference to a triumph?

2. The context does support a reference to another 'march past', not the triumphal one, but the one that formed part of the census, cf. the sense of *traducere* classified by *OLD* as 3b, i.e. 'equum *traducere* - of an *eques* who has passed the censor's scrutiny, to lead one's horse past'. The march past and the moral scrutiny are found in:

Ovid, *Tristia* 2.541-2 *carminaque edideram cum te delicta notantem*
praeterii totiens inrequietus eques

Livy 9.46.15 *Q.Fabius et P.Decius censores facti et Fabius simul concordiae causa ...*
ab eodem institutum dicitur ut equites idibus Quinctilibus transueherentur.

Suetonius, Aug.38 *equitum turmas frequenter recognovit, post longam intercapedinem re-*
ducto more transuectionis. sed neque detrahi quemquam in traehendo
ab accusatore passus est, quod fieri solebat ...

I would contend that Juvenal's *traducimur* is a pun on the double sense 'there we are exposed, dishonoured' / 'there we are led past [the censor]'².

3. The reference to censorship is supported by the general context of the satire, which is about moral criticism, in which references to censorship recur: cf. 3 *Curios*; 12 *promittunt atrocem animum*, the reference being to a Cato, admittedly not the Censor; 29 Domitian as censor; 35 *Scauros*; 40 *tertius a caelo cecidit Cato*; 63 *uexat censura columbas*; 121 *o proceres, censore opus est an haruspice nobis*.

4. What supports the reference to the censors in the immediately surrounding text is the context of lines 157-8, where, by a device common in Juvenal when that author is preparing his audience for a pun (about which device more will follow, at a later date), the less obvious sense of the word (in this case, the 'censorial' sense) is prepared for elaborately by what precedes. For in those two lines there is an elaborate and, one might feel, verbose reference to a lustration. It is this redundant description of lustration that prepares the audience mentally to see the censorial reference in *traducimur*. For the *lustrum*, the purification of the Roman people, was the culmination of the censorial review. This is well-known, but neatly exemplified for my purpose by the following passage of Valerius Maximus (4.1.10), which combines census, *lustrum*, and march past³:

ne Africanus quidem ... qui censor, cum lustrum conderet ... neque alia eius in
censura moderatio pro tribunali apparuit. centurias recognoscens equitum, post-
quam C.Licinium Sacerdotem 'transduc equum' inquit 'Sacerdos, ac lucrifac
censuriam notam ...'

5. The reference to the *lustrum*, suggested by the general context, supported by the closer context, is guaranteed by the passage Juvenal is parodying (the use of parody in Juvenal is a field that has hardly been touched by scholarly research). A *katabasis* in which the great heroes of early Rome are featured in Hades - Scipios, Fabricii, Camilli, Fabii - would necessarily recall to readers of Juvenal the famous parallel scene in *Aeneid* 6, in which those same heroes feature. In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas comes down to Hades to review those great heroes who will one day be his descendants; in Juvenal, those great heroes, 'descendants' in Virgil, are now the 'elders', and their descendants come down to Hades. In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas and

1. E.Courtney, *A commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London, Athlone Press, 1980.

2. It is not part of my argument that the first of these senses derives from the second. Rather I would say that Juvenal has juxtaposed a common sense of the word, here called for by the context, 'there we are dishonoured, exposed', with a more primary sense 'there we are marched past', which, however, acquires a precise connotation, the 'censorial' one, in its context. Juvenal may be encouraging his readers to explore, in addition, the possibility that the one sense derives from the other.

3. It is agreed that the *praeterealectio* of the Ides of July and that of the census were distinct under the Republic. For my argument it is sufficient that the censor was involved in both and that both involved a ride-past of the *equites* before the censor. It appears, too, that the situation became more confused under Augustus, when he revived the censorship, and we have little evidence of what the position was under Domitian when he became censor for life.

16

Anchises take pride in their 'descendants-to-be'; in Juvenal, the 'elders' are disgraced by their 'descendants-that-have-been'. In Juvenal, the elders, seeing their descendants among them, would wish to be 'lustrated'; in Virgil, Anchises 'lustrated' his descendants. The 'parade' of Roman heroes in *Aeneid* 6 opens as follows:

*at pater Anchises penitus conuallē uirenti
inclusas animas superumque ad lumen ituras
lustrabat studio recolens, omnemque suorum
forte recensēbat numerum, carosque nepotes
fataque fortunasque uirum moresque manusque*

Virgil, A.6.679-683

and it concludes as follows: *sic tota passim regione uagantur
aeris in campis latis atque omnia lustrant.*

On the former passage, Austin⁴ writes:

in this context it [*lustrare*] is a highly allusive and emotive word, suggesting to a Roman reader the quinquennial *lustratio* of the people, held by the censors, (cf. *recensēbat* 682). Anchises is like a Roman censor, making an official list, but a list of ghosts, destined to live again.

Juvenal is one of Austin's Roman readers, parodying Anchises' emotive *lustrum* in the ghosts' desire to be purified of the taint of pathics. As the whole Roman nation is glorified by the *lustrum* of *Aeneid* 6, so the whole Roman nation is disgraced by Juvenal's *lustrum*. The tone in Virgil is solemn and serious, in Juvenal it is off-hand and comical.

6. Looking back, then, on the passage of Juvenal as a whole, we observe that its development carefully and elaborately tends to one point: the concluding *sententia*, the punchline that leads through pun to parody to amusement of the literary connoisseur.

Verbal dexterity, literary allusiveness, the cleverness of the amoralist - what mischievous deity made Rudd and Courtney⁵, intent on exploding H.A.Mason's view that Juvenal is primarily a wit, choose this passage as their petard?

4. P. VERGILI MARONIS *Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Edited with a Commentary by R.G.Austin, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955 (repr. 1982).

5. N.Rudd & E.Courtney, edd., *Juvenal, Satires 1, 3, 10*, Bristol Classical Press 1977.

Copyright (C) 1983 Yvan Nadeau

J.PINSENT(Liverpool): *Pindar, Nemean 1.24 & Olympian 13.3*

LCM 8.1(Jan.1983) 16

1. In the latest number of the *Classical Quarterly* (NS33.2[1983]), pp.270-277, Paul Waring discusses with great learning and acumen a 'cluster of ideas and connotations' in Pindar and other lyric poetry, and it is with some trepidation that I suggest that perhaps on the line from which he takes his departure, *Nemean* 1.24, he may himself be 'bringing water against smoke', and that something can still be said for that interpretation of what surely must be a proverbial phrase. A general sense, that to blame the noble is 'futile effort' (Farnell ad loc.), is acceptable, and 'to bring water against smoke' can be futile in more than one way: it is misdirected - the water should be aimed not at the smoke but at the flame or fire (not a very complicated idea); it may be mistimed - the fire is already quenched, or no danger; or it may be a positive hindrance to those engaged in serious fire-fighting - the act of a man who wishes to appear to be assisting a communal work while avoiding the position of danger and effectiveness. Proverbs are often obscure in any language, and, as Farnell sagely observed, 'we have to swallow the proverb and take it one way or another'. Perhaps I can swallow more than others can, but I would be happier with Simonides 541P. and *Nemean* 7.61-63 as parallels if the former mentioned water as well as smoke and the latter smoke as well as water.

2. In the same number of the *Classical Quarterly*, pp.278-280, A.Wasserstein proposes ὀγνώσκειν for γινώσκω at *Olympian* 13.3, objecting that the causative use of γινώσκω is unparalleled, and that the meaning 'I shall get to know' is 'trivial and banal, a superfluous and indeed disturbing expression of an improbability', viz. that Pindar had never visited Corinth. But in fact he never had professionally: this is the only surviving victory ode and perhaps in fact the only victory ode that Pindar wrote for a Corinthian, and in that sense it was the first chance he had of publicly 'getting to know' Corinth and, of course, by implication, so 'causing others to know' about it. The ode is also unusual in that Pindar postpones so long naming the victor (in line 28, 2nd strophe): the similar cases I have found are only *Pythian* 1 (2nd antistrophe) and 3 (3rd epode), and *Nemean* 10 and 11 and *Isthmian* 7 (all 2nd strophe). Here at least the reason is that he devotes the first three stanzas to the praise of Corinth, for which this ode has provided the first such public opportunity. Perhaps, too, γινώσκω τὸν ἀλβίαν Κόρινθον (does the article require comment?) might be taken as equivalent to 'I shall get to know Corinth as ἀλβία' (cf. *Pythian* 10.1 ἀλβία Λακεδαιμόνων, though Lacedaemon is not there the home of the victory celebrated), as exemplified by the three Olympic victories of the house. For one reason or another, then, I suggest that γινώσκω may stand.

Copyright (C) 1983 J.Pinsent